

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are in the case. Claims 4, 10, 11, and 12 have been amended. Claims 1-3 have been allowed. The specification has been amended to effect minor corrections. No new matter is involved.

Claims 4-9 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, as being vague and confusing, and not describing the claimed invention in such full, clear, concise and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to make and use the invention, or as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention; the Examiner contending that the claim 4 sets forth a double recitation of the same structure previously identified in claim 1, and specifically contending that the "working gas inlet" of claim 1 is the same as the "inlet bubbling tube" of claim 4.

Claims 10-12 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as being vague and indefinite; the Examiner contending that the term "housing" in claim 10 has no antecedent support in the specification.

Claims 10-12 were further rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being vague and confusing; the Examiner contending that the term "said oxidant" has not been set out positively.

These rejections and objections are respectfully traversed in view of this amendment.



ended on page 1 to more

The specification has been amended on page 1 to more specifically refer to certain copending patents as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim 4 has been amended, the element "inlet bubbling tube" having been removed and replaced with a description providing greater detail concerning the structure of the working gas inlet. It is submitted that this change will put claim 4 in condition for allowance. Claims 5-9 are dependent from claim 4 and are allowable by dependency.

Claim 10 has been amended to redefine the element "housing" as a "tank" which has antecedent support in the specification.

Claim 10 also has been amended to positively recite the oxidant and the liquid metal fuel. Other amendments were made to Claim 10 to enhance linking between the elements. It is submitted, claim 10 as amended overcomes the Examiner's 35 USC § 112 rejection. The preambles of claims 11 and 12 have been amended to more particularly refer to the apparatus of claim 10. Claims 11-12 are dependent from claim 10 and are allowable by dependency.

It is submitted in view of these remarks that all grounds for rejection and objection have been removed by the foregoing amendment. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are therefore earnestly solicited.



The Examiner is invited to phone Michael J. McGowan, attorney for Applicant, 401-841-4736, if in his opinion such phone call would serve to expedite the prosecution of subject patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

PAUL M. DUNN

28 June 1993

MICHAEL J. MCGOWAN Attorney of Record Reg. No. 31042